No. 14-185

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

NOEL REYES MATA,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR.,

Respondent.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

JOINT APPENDIX

DONALD B. VERRILLI, JR.
SOLICITOR GENERAL
Counsel of Record
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Washington, DC 20530-0001
(202) 514-2217
supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov
Counsel for Respondent

RAED GONZALEZ
Counsel Of Record
GONZALEZ OLIVIERI LLC
2200 Southwest Fwy.
Suite 550
Houston, TX 77098
(713) 481-3040
rgonzalez@
gonzalezolivierillc.com

WILLIAM R. PETERSON
Counsel of Record
BECK REDDEN
1221 McKinney Street
Suite 4500
Houston, TX 77010
(713) 951-6236
wpeterson@beckredden.com
Court-Appointed Amicus Curiae

MARK C. FLEMING
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
Counsel for Petitioner

Library of Con
Law Libra

PETITION FOR CERTIORARI FILED AUGUST 14, 2014
CERTIORARI GRANTED JANUARY 16, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Docket listing excerpts of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, No. 13-60253 1

Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals, dated September 21, 2012 4

Corrected Decision of the Immigration Judge, dated August 24, 2011 6

Transcript of hearing before the Immigration Judge, dated August 24, 2011 14

APPENDIX

DOCKET LISTING EXCERPTS UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT, NO. 13-60253

NOEL REYES MATA

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL

04/18/2013	IMMIGRATION CASE docketed. Petition for review filed by Petitioner Mr. Noel Reyes Mata. Date received in 5th Circuit: 04/18/2013. Fee due on 05/02/2013 for Petitioner Noel Reyes Mata. Administrative Record due on 05/28/2013 [13-60253] (SBS)
	* * *
05/09/2013	ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILED. Electronic Pleadings; Administrative record deadline satisfied. [13-60253] (AGL)
	* * *
07/03/2013	APPELLANT'S BRIEF FILED by Mr. Noel Reyes Mata *Petitioner*. Date of service: 07/03/2013 via email - Attorney for Petitioner: Gonzalez; Attorney for Respondents: Cox, da Rocha-Afodu [13-60253] REVIEWED AND/OR EDITED. # of Copies Provided: 0 A/Pet's Brief deadline satisfied. Appellee's Brief due on 08/05/2013 for Respondent Eric H. Holder, Jr., U.S. Attorney General. Paper Copies of Brief due on 07/08/2013 for Petitioner Noel Reyes Mata. [13-60253] (Raed Gonzalez)

* * *

08/13/2013 1st SUPPLEMENTAL ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD ON APPEAL FILED. Supp Electronic Pldg; Administrative record deadline satisfied. [13-60253] (AGL)

* * *

09/04/2013 APPELLEE'S BRIEF FILED by Respondent Mr. Eric H. Holder, Jr., U.S. Attorney General. Date of service: 09/04/2013 via email Attorney for Petitioner: Gonzalez; Attorney for Respondents: Cox, Fiorino, da Rocha-Afodu [13-60253] REVIEWED AND/OR EDITED. APPELLEE'S BRIEF FILED. # of Copies Provided: 0. E/Res's Brief deadline satisfied. Reply Brief due on 09/23/2013 for Petitioner Noel Reyes Mata. Paper Copies of Brief due on 09/09/2013 for Respondent Eric H. Holder, Jr., U.S. Attorney General. [13-60253] (Paul Fiorino)

* * *

09/23/2013 APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF FILED by Mr. Noel Reyes Mata *Petitioner* Date of service: 09/23/2013 via email - Attorney for Petitioner: Gonzalez; Attorney for Respondents: Cox, Fiorino, da Rocha-Afodu [13-60253] REVIEWED AND/OR EDITED. # of Copies Provided: 0. Reply Brief deadline satisfied. Paper Copies of Brief due on 09/30/2013 for Petitioner Noel Reyes Mata. [13-60253] (Raed Gonzalez)

* * *

03/05/2014	UNPUBLISHED OPINION FILED. [13-60253 Affirmed in Part and Dismissed in Part for Lack of Jurisdiction] Judge: RHB , Judge: CH , Judge: SAH. Mandate pull date is 04/28/2014 [13-60253] (JRS)
03/05/2014	JUDGMENT ENTERED AND FILED. [13-60253] (JRS)

* * *

04/17/2014	PETITION filed by Petitioner Mr. Noel Reyes Mata *Petitioner*, for rehearing en banc [7613646-2]. Date of Service: 04/17/2014 via email - Attorney for Petitioner: Gonzalez; Attorney for Respondents: Cox, Fiorino, da Rocha-Afodu [13-60253] (Raed Gonzalez)

* * *

05/16/2014	COURT ORDER denying petition for rehearing en banc filed by Petitioner Mr. Noel Reyes Mata [7613646-2] (IN DETAIL). Without Poll. Mandate pull date is 05/23/2014. [13-60253] (DLJ)
05/27/2014	MANDATE ISSUED. Mandate pull date satisfied. [13-60253] (SBS)

* * *

U.S. Department of Justice
Executive Office for Immigration Review

Falls Church, Virginia 22041

Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

File: A200 723 795 - Houston, TX
Date: [Stamp: SEP 21 2012]

[Stamp: RECEIVED
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
2013 JAN-4 AM 9:46
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR
IMMIGRATION REVIEW
IMMIGRATION COURT
HOUSTON, TEXAS]

In re: NOEL REYES MATA a.k.a. Alberto Reyes Reyes

IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS

APPEAL

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT: Aseph Almas, Esquire

ON BEHALF OF DHS: John Donovan
Assistant Chief Counsel

APPLICATION: Cancellation of removal under section 240A(b)(1)

The respondent's appeal will be summarily dismissed under the provisions of 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.1(d)(2)(i)(A) and (E). The Notice of Appeal does not contain statements that meaningfully apprise the Board of specific reasons underlying the challenge

to the Immigration Judge's decision. *See Matter of Lodge*, 19 I&N Dec. 500 (BIA 1987); *Matter of Valencia*, 19 I&N Dec. 354 (BIA 1986).

Additionally, the respondent checked the block on the Notice of Appeal indicating that a separate written brief or statement would be filed in support of the appeal. The Notice of Appeal contains a clear warning that the appeal may be subject to summary dismissal if the appellant indicates that such a brief or statement will be filed and, within the time set for filing, fails to file the brief or statement and does not reasonably explain such failure. The respondent was granted the opportunity to submit a brief or statement in support of the appeal. However, the record indicates that he did not file such brief or statement, or reasonably explain the failure to do so, within the time set for filing. Accordingly, the appeal will be summarily dismissed under the provisions noted above.

ORDER: The respondent's appeal is summarily dismissed.

/s/ [illegible]
FOR THE BOARD

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
IMMIGRATION COURT
Houston, Texas

File A 200 723 795
August 24, 2011
IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS

In the Matter of

NOEL REYES MATA,
Respondent

CHARGE: Section 212(a)(6)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended.

APPLICATION: Cancellation of removal for certain unlawful permanent residents pursuant to Section 240A(b)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended.

* * *

ORAL DECISIONAND ORDER OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE

I. Introduction

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) commenced these removal proceedings against respondent on September 21, 2010, charging him with being removable pursuant to the above-captioned section of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Act). The hearings in this matter were conducted in Houston, Texas.

At a master calendar hearing held on January 24, 2011, respondent admitted the factual allegations and conceded removability as charged in the Notice to Appear (NTA). Respondent designated Mexico as the country of removal, should removal become necessary. Based on respondent's admissions and concessions, in addition to the information memorialized in Exhibit 2, the Court found him removable as set forth in the NTA by clear and convincing evidence. As to relief from removal, the respondent applied for cancellation of removal for certain non-lawful permanent residents under Section 240B(a)(1) of the Act. It is respondent's eligibility for such relief that is currently before this Court.

For the reasons set forth below, the Court will deny respondent's cancellation application, Form EOIR-42B as a matter of law.

II. Summary of Evidentiary Record

The record in this case consists of the admission of four Exhibits.

Exhibit 1 is the NTA dated September 15th, 2010. It was filed by DHS on September 21, 2010.

Exhibit 2 is a record of deportable/inadmissible alien, Form 1-213, dated September 15, 2010.

Exhibit 3 consists of criminal records relating to respondent's conviction for Assault-Family Member entered on September 14, 2010. The documents are tabbed A-D.

Exhibit 4 consists of respondent's Form EOIR-42B and supporting documents, tabbed A-E.

All admitted evidence identified above has been considered regardless of whether specifically mentioned in the text of this decision.

III. Factual Background

The facts regarding respondent's criminal history are not in dispute. On or about September 14, 2010, respondent pleaded guilty to, and was convicted for, the Class A misdemeanor of Assault-Family Member. See Exhibit 3, Tabs A-B. His victim was Vanessa Hernandez, an individual identified as a person with whom respondent had a dating relationship.

The criminal court also made an affirmative finding of family violence in connection with the offense. See Exhibit 3, Tab B. Prior to the conviction, respondent was ordered to remain away from Ms. Hernandez for 60 days in connection with the entry of an emergency protective order. See Exhibit 3 Tab C. For the assault offense, respondent was sentenced to 30 days in county jail.

IV. Statement of the Law

A. Cancellation of Removal for Non-Lawful Permanent Residents

The Legal [sic] Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), abolished suspension of deportation under former Section 240A of the Act and replaced it with a restrictive procedure called cancellation of removal, effective April 1, 1997. See IIRIRA Sec. 304(a)(3); INA Sec. 240A(b)(1). As an applicant for cancellation of removal under Section 240A(b)(1) of the Act, an alien must demonstrate: (1) physical presence in the United States for a continuous period of not less than 10 years immediately preceding

the date of application; (2) good moral character during that period; (3) no criminal convictions which are offenses under Section 212(a)(2), 237(a)(2), or 237(a)(3); and, (4) removal would result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to the alien's spouse, parent or child who is a United States citizen or lawful permanent resident. The applicant's hardship is no longer considered. INA Sec. 240A(b)(1).

B. Crime Involving Moral Turpitude

The term "moral turpitude" is not defined by the Act and has been described as a nebulous concept by the courts. See, e.g., Matter of Danesh, 19 I&N Dec. 669 (BIA 1988). In identifying conduct that is inherently depraved or intrinsically wrong, courts often look for certain aggravating factors, such as a perpetrator's use of unjustified violence or a deadly weapon, the endangerment of human life or the presence of criminal or evil intent. Fundamental to that determination is whether the Act is accompanied by a vicious motive or a corrupt mind. Hamdan v. INS, 98 F.3d 183, 186 (5th Cir. 1996).

Pursuant to the Attorney General's decision in Matter of Silva-Trevino, 24 I&N Dec. 687 (A.G. 2008), this Court must first examine the statutory elements of the conviction under a categorical approach, then, if necessary, consider the record of conviction under a modified categorical approach and can, if necessary, and appropriate, consider evidence beyond the formal record of conviction. The Court may examine documents such as the indictment, the judgment and conviction, jury instructions, assign [sic] guilty plea, and a plea transcript. See Matter of Short, 20 I&N Dec. 135, 137 (BIA 1989); Hyder v. Keisler, 506 F.3d 388, 391 (5th Cir. 2007).

V. Findings of the Court

Inasmuch as respondent's application for cancellation of removal was filed after May 11, 2005, it is governed by the provisions of the REAL ID Act of 2005. See Matter of S-B-, 24 I&N Dec. 42 (BIA 2006). In that regard, respondent fully bears the burden of establishing that he is eligible for the relief that he seeks.

For the reasons set forth below, the Court finds that respondent is statutorily ineligible for cancellation of removal as a matter of law and will pretermit his application. Respondent's conviction for Assault-Family Member is a crime involving moral turpitude, which renders him ineligible for cancellation of removal under Section 240A(b)(1)(C) of the Act.

There is no dispute the respondent pleaded guilty to, and was convicted for, the Class A misdemeanor of assault with an affirmative finding that the victim of the crime was a member of his family. See Exhibit 3, Tabs A-B. Under Section 22.01(a)(1) of the Texas Penal Code, a person commits a Class A misdemeanor if he intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly causes bodily injury to another, including the person's spouse. Texas Penal Code § 22.01(a)(1). Section 22.01(a)(1) of the Texas Penal Code is divisible, and [sic] that it includes offenses that would be considered crimes involving moral turpitude, as well as offenses that would not. First, it covers simple assaults, which the Board has generally held do not involve moral turpitude. See Matter of Solon, 24 I&N Dec. 239,242 [sic] (BIA 2007); Matter of Fualaau, 21 I&N Dec. 475 (BIA 1996); Matter of Perez-Contreras, 20 I&N Dec. 615 (BIA 1992). Section 22.01(a)(1) also covers assault against a spouse, which the Board has found in some cases to be a crime involving moral turpitude because inflicting harm upon

a family member is of a different, more serious nature than inflicting harm upon a stranger. See Matter of Tran, 21 I&N Dec. 291, 294 (BIA 1996); Matter of Sanudo, 23 I&N Dec. 968, 972 (BIA 2006).

As the state statute at issue here is divisible, the Court must use a modified categorical approach and examine the respondent's record of conviction. See Matter of Silva-Trevino, 24 I&N Dec. 687, 690 (A.G. 2008). Respondent's judgment of conviction indicates that the presiding judge made an affirmative finding of family violence. See Exhibit 3, Tab B, Page 3. Additionally, the criminal information to which respondent pleaded guilty indicates that respondent did unlawfully, intentionally, and knowingly cause bodily injury to Vanessa Hernandez, a person with whom he had a dating relationship, by striking her with his foot and grabbing her with his hand. Under Texas law, a family member is defined, inter alia, as a person in a dating relationship. See Tex. Penal Code Ann. Section 22.01(b)(2) (West Supp. 2010); Tex. Fam. Code Ann. Section 71.0021(b), 71.003, 71.005(West 2010). Texas law further defines a dating relationship as a relationship between individuals who have or have had a continuing relationship of a romantic or intimate nature. It does not include a casual acquaintance in a business or social context. Tex. Fam. Code Ann. Section 71.0021(b)-(c).

The Court finds that the respondent's intentional acts of striking or grabbing another with whom he has a close, personal relationship and causing a physical injury is morally reprehensible and necessarily involves turpitudinous conduct, and thus is a crime involving moral turpitude. See Matter of Tran, 21 I&N Dec. at 294; Matter of Sanudo, 23 I&N Dec. at 972. Under Texas law, the maximum punishment for a Class A misdemeanor is one year. See Tex. Penal Code Section 12.21(2).

The dispositive issue then becomes whether or not such conviction is described under Section 212(a)(2), 237(a)(2) or 237(a)(3) of the Act, thereby rendering the respondent ineligible for cancellation of removal. See INA Sec. 240A(b)(1)(C). The Board clarified the analysis required in order to determine this question of law in recent precedent decisions. See Matter of Cortez, 25 I&N Dec. 301 (BIA 2010); Matter of Pedroza, 25 I&N Dec. 312 (BIA 2010). In Cortez, the Board explained that in order to determine if a crime involving moral turpitude is described under Sections 212(a)(2), 237(a)(2) or 237(a)(3) of the Act, only language specifically pertaining to the criminal offense, such as the offense itself, and sentence imposed or potentially imposed, should be considered. Matter of Cortez, 25 I&N Dec. 307. The Board further explained that statutory language relating only to aspects of Immigration Law, such as the requirement under Section 237(a)(2) that an offense be committed within five years after the date of admission is not to be considered in the crime involving moral turpitude analysis. The Board concluded that in order for an offense to be described under Section 237(a)(2)(A)(i) of the Act and render a respondent ineligible for cancellation, the crime must be a crime involving moral turpitude and must be punishable by a sentence to imprisonment for a year or longer. Matter of Cortez, 25 I&N Dec. at 307.

In light of Board precedent, this Court concludes that respondent has been convicted of an offense described under Section 237(a)(2) of the Act, a crime involving moral turpitude for which a sentence of one year or longer may be imposed and is thus ineligible for relief of cancellation of removal. Furthermore, the question of whether respondent's conviction qualifies for a petty offense exception under 212(a)(2)(A)(ii)(II)

of the Act need not be determined, because regardless of the results of such inquiry, the conviction remains an offense described under Section 237(a)(2). Therefore, the Court further concludes that respondent's conviction for assault to a family member renders him ineligible for cancellation of removal.

Respondent has not identified any other form of relief. The circumstances in these proceedings leave no alternative except to issue an order of removal to respondent's native country of Mexico.

VI. Conclusion and Orders

For the reasons discussed, the following orders will enter:

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that respondent's application for cancellation of removal for certain nonpermanent residents under Section 240A(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, is pretermitted and denied as a matter of law.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondent shall be removed to Mexico on the charge specified in the Notice to Appear, dated September 15, 2010.[1]

Appeal due September 23, 2011.

Date: August 24, 2011.

/s/ Lisa Luis
LISA LUIS
Immigration Judge

[1] Respondent will be advised of his appeal rights separately on the record.

U.S. Department of Justice
Executive Office for Immigration Review
Immigration Court

File A 200 723 795
IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS
Transcript of Hearing

Matter of

NOEL REYES MATA,
Respondent

Before LISA LUIS, Immigration Judge

Date: August 24, 2011 Place: Houston, Texas

* * *

JUDGE FOR THE RECORD

Okay. We're on the record. It is now, it's Wednesday, August 24th, 2011. This is Immigration Judge Lisa Luis, sitting in Houston, Texas. And this is a continued removal proceeding in the matter of Noel Reyes Mata, A number 200 723 795. Respondent is present in court and is represented.

JUDGE TO COUNSEL

Q. Counsel, please state your appearances.

A. (Mr. Almas) Aseph Almas for the respondent.

A. (Mr. Donovan) John Donovan, D-O-N-O-V-A-N, for the Government.

Q. All right, good afternoon, Mr. Almas and Mr. Donovan.

JUDGE TO MR. ALMAS

Q. Mr. Almas, what language does your client speak and understand the best?

A. Spanish.

Q. Our Spanish interpreter today is Ms. Esmin Tate, she's an employee with the Department of Justice.

JUDGE TO MR. REYES

Q. To the respondent through the interpreter, sir, what is your name?

A. Noel Reyes Mata.

Q. All right, sir. Please stand and raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you provide in these proceedings will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

A. Yes.

Q. All right. Please take your seat.

JUDGE TO MR. ALMAS

Q. Mr. Almas, we're here to address the respondent's application for cancellation of removal for non-lawful permanent residents. After the last hearing, the Government filed some Exhibits tabbed A through D regarding a criminal conviction record for assault on a family member. Did you receive those?

A. Yes, Your Honor.

Q. All right. Any objection?

A. No, Your Honor.

Q. This entire packet will be admitted as Exhibit 3. We're going to give you the respondent's application for cancellation of removal. Please look it over, have

him look it over and make any necessary amendments and then sign and date.

JUDGE TO MR. REYES

Q. Sir, I am returning your application for cancellation of removal. Please look it over and make any necessary amendments.

A. (No audible response.)

JUDGE TO MR. DONOVAN

Q. The background checks complete and current, Mr. Donovan?

A. Correct.

Q. I don't believe I have an order for this one. I don't see (indiscernible). Our interpreter stepped out for just a moment.

JUDGE FOR MR. ALMAS

Q. While we wait for her, Mr. Almas, I've looked over the conviction records provided by the Government and it seems to me the respondent has a problem here in that his conviction for assault with an affirmative finding of the victim being a family member, appears to me to be a CIMT that would preclude him from cancellation of removal. Is there any issue that this is a conviction record that relates to him?

A. No, Your Honor. That conviction relates to him.

Q. All right. Is there any issue that as far as the dates of the judgment, here it shows September 14th, 2010, yes, September 14th, 2010 that it's a Class A misdemeanor?

A. No. There's no issue.

Q. And that he pled guilty to the information that's attached at Tab A?

A. No, Your Honor, he did plead guilty.

Q. All right. So that's not an issue at all and that he received 30 days, a 30-day sentence for the offense.

A. Yes. The only issue that he made to me and I indicated to him that's not going to be relevant, that his wife signed an affidavit of non-prosecution and gave that to the district attorney's office, however, the District Attorney went forward with the case and he pled guilty.

Q. Okay.

A. So I indicated to him that's not going to be an issue.

Q. Okay.

A. In the court.

Q. All right. All right.

JUDGE TO MR. REYES

Q. Through the interpreter to the respondent, sir, you've had a chance to review your application for cancellation of removal. And has anyone explained to you the contents of this application in a language you understand?

A. This application now?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes.

Q. And do you swear under penalty of perjury that all the information contained in the application along with all of the documentation attached to it is true and correct?

A. Yes.

Q. All right.

JUDGE TO MR. DONOVAN

Q. Mr. Donovan, any objections to the application for cancellation of removal along with Tabs A through E?

A. No.

Q. All right. This will be admitted as Exhibit 4. All right.

JUDGE TO MR. ALMAS

Q. Back to the issue of the criminal conviction, Mr. Almas. So his criminal history is not in dispute at all as presented in his conviction records that the Government has filed, correct?

A. Right.

Q. All right. Well, I don't believe he's eligible at this point for cancellation of removal.

JUDGE TO MR. DONOVAN

Q. Mr. Donovan, do you want to be heard on this?

A. Well, we agree with the Court, Your Honor.

Q. Okay.

JUDGE TO MR. ALMAS

Q. So what I'm going to do today, Mr. Almas, is pretermit his application. I'm not going to listen to any further testimony regarding the other elements of his eligibility for cancellation of removal. What I'm going to do, deny the application. Is there any other form of relief that he's seeking?

A. (Mr. Almas) No, Your Honor.

A. (Mr. Donovan) None at all.

Q. And no post-hearing voluntary departure. Is that correct?

A. (Mr. Almas) That's correct.

Q. Okay. All right.

JUDGE TO MR. REYES

Q. To the respondent through the interpreter, sir, I've reviewed the criminal conviction records that the Government has filed in your case. And it is my opinion that your conviction for assault on a family member is sufficient to preclude you from showing eligibility for cancellation of removal. And as your attorney has explained to me, the conviction record itself and the facts of conviction are not in dispute. And I'm going to deny your application as a matter of law, and in a few moments, I'm going to issue an oral decision explaining in detail why I believe you do not qualify for that form of relief. When I finish with that decision, I will come back to you and I will explain to you your rights to appeal my decision.

JUDGE RENDERS ORAL DECISION

JUDGE TO MR. ALMAS

Mr. Almas, Mr. Donovan, you've heard the Court's decision denying the respondent's application for cancellation of removal as a matter of law. Mr. Almas, do you reserve your client's right to appeal?

A. Yes.

Q. And Mr. Almas, let me just remind you again that the appeal will be due at the Board of Immigration Appeals no later than September 23rd, 2011.

JUDGE TO MR. DONOVAN

Q. Mr. Donovan, do you waive or reserve the Government's right to appeal?

A. Waive, Your Honor.

JUDGE TO COUNSEL

Q. All right. Mr. Almas and Mr. Donovan, I have the summary orders here. Just let me know if you have any issues or concerns as to the (indiscernible) order.

JUDGE TO MR. REYES

Q. To the respondent through the interpreter, sir, I have just finished rendering an oral decision, denying your application for cancellation and ordering you removed from the United States to Mexico. You have an absolute right to appeal my decision, in fact, your attorney has already reserved your right to appeal.

Now, to perfect your appeal, you have to file a notice of appeal on a document called an EOIR-26 and you have to file that with the Board of Immigration Appeals, that is a higher court, no later than 30 calendar days from today's date. That means that the Board of Immigration Appeals has to receive your appeal no later than September 23rd, 2011. You may obtain the appeal forms and the written instructions at the administrative section of this court. Now, if the time period expires and you do not file an appeal then my decision will become final. You may continue to have legal representation on appeal, but without expense to the United States Government. And if you cannot afford the fees on appeal, you may request the Board of Immigration Appeals to waive those fees and they will consider your request. Do you have any questions about your appeal rights, sir?

A. No.

Q. All right. Do you have any questions about anything else in your case before we conclude today?

A. Could I try to reopen my criminal case?

Q. That's something that you need to talk to your lawyers about, sir. I don't have any jurisdiction over your criminal case. Any other questions?

A. (No audible response.)

Q. No.

JUDGE TO MR. ALMAS

Q. Mr. Almas, any concerns as to the form of the summary order?

A. No.

Q. All right. Anything further?

A. No.

JUDGE TO MR. DONOVAN

Q. Mr. Donovan, any concerns as to the form of the order?

A. None.

Q. All right. Anything else from DHS?

A. Nothing else, Your Honor.

JUDGE FOR THE RECORD

All right. That brings this matter to conclusion.

MR. ALMAS TO JUDGE

Q. Thank you, Your Honor.

HEARING CLOSED